



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/533,842

05/04/2005

Ian Clarke

P/3653-12

6092

2352 7590 01/12/2009  
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN  
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK, NY 100368403

EXAMINER

WIEST, PHILIP R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3761

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/12/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/533,842	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CLARKE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Phil Wiest	<b>Art Unit</b> 3761	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Phil Wiest. (3) Anna Vishev.

(2) Leslie Deak. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 07 January 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Laing, Keime.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the rejection mailed 11/5/08 and potential changes that might overcome the current rejection. It is the examiner's opinion that Laing and Keime reasonably suggest the device as described in applicant's specification. Therefore, it is suggested that applicant filed an affidavit stating the benefits of the instant invention (supported by data), and stating why the combination of Laing and Keime would not have been obvious.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Phil Wiest/ Examiner, Art Unit 3761	/Leslie Deak/ Primary Examiner, AU 3761
---	--